



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,131	02/12/2002	David Jeffery Hayes	PT03772U	6604
20280 7590 01/05/2011 MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 W2-55BB LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343				
EXAMINER				
PENG, FRED H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2426				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/05/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.MOBILITY@MOTOROLA.COM

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/074,131

## Applicant(s)

HAYES ET AL.

## Examiner

FRED PENG

## Art Unit

2426

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34, 36-70 and 72-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34, 36-70 and 72-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered 10/20/2010.
2. The Final Office Action of 07/30/2010 is fully incorporated into this Final Office Action by reference.

### ***Status of Claims***

3. Claims 1-34, 36-70 and 72-86 are pending in this application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 24, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 50, 55, 58, 61, 64, 66-70, 72-73 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakata et al (US 2006/0271993).

Regarding claims 1, 31, 64 and 81, Nakata discloses a communication system (FIG.1, 1) having a plurality of clients including a first client and a second client (FIG.1, 3A, 3B), a method for providing continuity of at least one broadcast event between the plurality of clients (FIG.1, 3A, 3B) comprising:

monitoring the at least one broadcast event by the first client (Para 74 lines 1-8; Para 75 lines 1-6; Para 111 lines 4-11), and

launching monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by the second client in response to an occurrence associated with the at least one broadcast event to transfer the monitoring of the at least one broadcast event from the first client to the second client (Para 79 lines 4-7; Para 82 lines 1-6; Para 83 lines 1-6; Para 86 lines 5-10; Para 113; transferring the monitoring of a program from a living room to a bedroom),

wherein the communication system (1) comprises a first system (monitor device 3A in one room such as living room connected to the optical disk device through the network I/F as the first system) and a second system (monitor device 3B in another room such as bed room connected to the optical disk device through the network I/F as the second system), wherein the first client device (3A) operates within the first system and the second client device (3B) operates within the second system (each client device operating in a different room is interpreted as operating in a separate system; furthermore, the device interconnection might not be limited to IEEE1394 interface, a diversity of serial and parallel interfaces and further in a variety of wire or wireless communication network are also used as shown in Para 112).

Regarding claims 2 and 32, Nakata further discloses disabling monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by the first client (Para 81 lines 1-4).

Regarding claims 4, 34 and 66, Nakata further discloses one or a combination of broadcast events selected from a group consisting of a sports game, a simulcast concert, a television program (Para 111 lines 5-9), a networked program, and a radio program.

Regarding claims 5, 58 and 67, Nakata further discloses the occurrence comprising one or a combination of occurrences selected from a group consisting of an event start time, a user input received by the first client, a user input received by the second client (Para 82 lines 1-6), a deactivation of the first client, an activation of the second client, and an establishment of a communication connection between the first client and the second client.

Regarding claims 6 and 68, Nakata further discloses the first client operating within a first device (FIG.1, 3A) and further wherein the second client operating within a second device (FIG.1, 3B).

Regarding claims 7, 36, 69, and 72, Nakata further discloses the first device is a device selected from a group consisting of a network device (FIG.1, 3A), a mobile device, and a cable box.

Regarding claims 8, 37, 70 and 73, Nakata further discloses the second device is a device selected from a group consisting of a network device (FIG.1, 3B), a mobile device, and a cable box.

Regarding claims 9, 38 and 61, Nakata further discloses initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer prior to the launching step (Para 77 lines 1-6; Para 79 lines 4-7).

Regarding claims 24 and 50, Nakata further discloses the occurrence comprises:  
sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client (Para 77; Para 78).

Regarding claims 28 and 55, Nakata further discloses the occurrence comprises:  
sending a monitoring notification from the second client to the first client (FIG.1, 3A, 3B are identical set-up, the operation between them are identical, this includes sending a monitoring notification from 3B to 3A).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 33 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata et al (US 2006/0271993) in view of Russell et al (US 2002/0049679).

Regarding claims 3, 33 and 65, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 31 and 64.

Nakata is silent about transferring a monitoring license from the first client to the second client prior to the launching step.

In an analogous art, Russell teaches transferring a monitoring license from the first client to the second client prior to the launching step (Para 67 lines 1-6).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include transferring a monitoring license from one client to another client prior to the launching step, as taught by Russell so that a licensed copy can be better protected.

6. Claims 10-23, 25-27, 29-30, 39-49, 51-54, 56-57, 59-60, 62-63, 74-80, 82-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata et al (US 2006/0271993) in view of Finseth et al (US 2005/0028207).

Regarding Claims 10, 74 and 82, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81.

Nakata is silent about storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer

Art Unit: 2426

step, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes choosing the second client from the stored at least one transfer client profile.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step (FIG.7; Para 81 lines 1-6), wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes choosing the second client from the stored at least one transfer client profile (Para 81 lines 9-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes choosing the second client from the stored at least one transfer client profile, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claims 11, 75 and 83, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81.

Nakata is silent about storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and

linking the second client profile with the at least one broadcast event, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast event.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step (FIG.9, 174, Para 92 lines 3-10); and linking the second client profile with the at least one broadcast

event, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast event (Para 92 lines 11-13).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and linking the second client profile with the at least one broadcast event, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast event, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claims 12, 76 and 84, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81.

Nakata is silent about storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and linking the second client profile with a broadcast channel, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes identifying the broadcast channel associated with the at least one broadcast event, and retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast channel.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and linking the second client profile with a broadcast channel, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes:

identifying the broadcast channel associated with the at least one broadcast event (Para 84 lines 1-3), and



retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast channel (Para 84 lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to **modify Nakata's system** to include storing at least one transfer client profile associated with at least one of the plurality of clients including a second client profile associated with the second client in the first client prior to the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step; and linking the second client profile with a broadcast channel, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step including identifying the broadcast channel associated with the at least one broadcast event; and retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the at least one broadcast channel, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claims 13, 77 and 85, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81.

Nakata is silent about linking the second client profile with a time period, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes:

identifying the time period associated with the at least one broadcast event; and  
retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the time period.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches linking the second client profile with a time period (FIG.12, 206), wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step includes:

identifying the time period associated with the at least one broadcast event (FIG.12, 206);  
and

retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the time period (FIG.12, 208, Para 96 lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to **modify Nakata's system** to include linking the second client profile with a time period, wherein the initiating a broadcast monitoring transfer step including identifying

Art Unit: 2426

the time period associated with the at least one broadcast event; and retrieving from storage the second client profile linked to the time period, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claims 14, 39, 78 and 86, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 64, 68 and 81. Nakata further discloses sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client, wherein the monitoring notification includes a broadcast channel identifier (Para 111 lines 8-13).

Nakata is silent about sending a request for a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the second client to the broadcast server; and receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the second client.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches sending a request for a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the second client to the broadcast server (Para 84 lines 1-5); and

receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the second client (Para 84 lines 1-5, building his/her own program guide requires requesting and receiving broadcast information from the broadcast server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include sending a request for a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the second client to the broadcast server; and receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the second client, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claim 15, the claim is met by Nakata and Finseth. In particular, Finseth discloses the monitoring notification including a time stamp (Para 82 lines 1-5, transmission through the internet includes the time stamp).

Regarding Claims 16, 40 and 79, Finseth further discloses one or a combination of broadcast information selected from a group consisting of an event start time, an event end time, a plurality of event connection information, and a plurality of media information (Para 81 lines 3-6).

Regarding Claims 17, 41 and 80, Finseth further discloses the plurality of media information including a plurality of canned content information (Para 84 lines 1-5).

Regarding Claims 18 and 43, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 31 and 38.

Nakata is silent about sending a request for a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the first client to the broadcast server; receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the first client; and

sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client, wherein the monitoring notification includes the plurality of broadcast information.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches sending a request for a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the first client to the broadcast server;

receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the first client (FIG.4, 88A, Para 64 lines 7-12, Para 70 lines 1-5); and

sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client, wherein the monitoring notification includes the plurality of broadcast information (Para 80).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include sending a request for a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the first client to the broadcast server; receiving the plurality of broadcast information from the broadcast server by the first client; and sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client, wherein the monitoring notification includes the plurality of broadcast information taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claim 19, Finseth further discloses one or a combination of broadcast information selected from a group consisting of an event start time, an event end time, a plurality of event connection information, and a plurality of media information (FIG.4, 94; Para 80 lines 4-6).

Regarding Claims 20 and 44, Finseth further discloses the plurality of media information including a plurality of canned content information (FIG.4, 106).

Regarding Claims 21, 29, 46 and 56, Nakata does disclose all the limitations in Claims 1, 9, 28, 31, and 55. Nakata further discloses sending a monitoring notification from the first client to the second client (Para 111 lines 8-13).

Nakata is silent about requesting a plurality of broadcast information by the second client prior to the launching step in response to the monitoring notification; and

sending the plurality of broadcast information from the first client to the second client in response to the requesting step.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches requesting a plurality of broadcast information by the second client prior to the launching step in response to the monitoring notification (Para 91 lines 1-3, in order to view the program guide, viewer needs to request, like using remote control); and sending the plurality of broadcast information from the first client to the second client in response to the requesting step (Para 91 lines 1-7, per user's request, server sending the program guide to the receiver).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include requesting a plurality of broadcast information by the second client prior to the launching step in response to the monitoring notification; and sending the plurality of broadcast information from the first client to the second client in response to the requesting step, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claims 22 and 47, Finseth further discloses the plurality of broadcast information comprising one or a combination of broadcast information selected from a group consisting of an event start time, an event end time, a plurality of event connection information, and a plurality of media information (FIG.4, 94).

Regarding Claims 23 and 48, Finseth further discloses the plurality of media information includes a plurality of canned content information (FIG.4, 106).

Regarding Claims 25 and 51, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claims 1, 24, 31, and 50.

Nakata is silent about the monitoring notification including a plurality of broadcast information.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches the monitoring notification including a plurality of broadcast information (FIG.4, 94).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include the monitoring notification including a plurality of broadcast information, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claims 26 and 52, Finseth further discloses the plurality of broadcast information comprising one or a combination of broadcast information selected from a group consisting of an event start time, an event end time, a plurality of event connection information, and a plurality of media information (FIG.4, 94).

Regarding Claims 27 and 53, Finseth further discloses the plurality of media information including a plurality of canned content information (FIG.4, 106).

Regarding Claims 30 and 57, Nakata discloses all the limitations as in Claims 1, 28, 31, and 55.

Nakata is silent about the monitoring notification including a second client profile.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches the monitoring notification including a second client profile (FIG.9, 176A).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include the monitoring notification including a second client profile, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claim 42, Finseth further discloses a plurality of canned content information is associated with the at least one broadcast event (FIG.4, 106), the method further comprising:

determining the plurality of canned content information by the second device in response to the receiving of the plurality of broadcast information step (FIG.7, 140, Para 84, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claims 45, 49 and 54, Finseth further discloses receiving the monitoring notification including the plurality of broadcast information by the second transfer application operating within the second device (FIG.7, 138, Para 83); and

determining the plurality of canned content information by the second device in response to the receiving of the monitoring notification including the plurality of broadcast information step (FIG.7, 140, Para 84).

Regarding Claim 59, Nakata discloses all the limitations in Claim 31.

Nakata is silent about downloading an event monitoring application by the second device prior to the launching step.

In an analogous art, Finseth teaches downloading an event monitoring application by the second device prior to the launching step (Para 84, build a personal program guide based on the information from first device).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include downloading an event monitoring application by the second device prior to the launching step, as taught by Finseth so that more information regarding broadcast program can be shared.

Regarding Claim 60, Finseth further discloses receiving a navigational path from the first device by the second device prior to the downloading step (the shared viewing preference information from 1<sup>st</sup> device to the 2<sup>nd</sup> device is a navigational path), wherein the downloading step comprising downloading the event monitoring application using the navigational path (Para 84 lines 1-7).

Regarding Claim 62, Nakata discloses within a communication system (FIG.1, 1, Para 111 lines 4-8) having a plurality of devices including a first device (FIG.1, 3A) and a second device (FIG.1, 3B), a method for providing continuity of at least one broadcast event between the plurality of devices comprising:

monitoring the at least one broadcast event by a first client on the first device (FIG.1, 3A) ; transferring a plurality of broadcast information associated with the at least one broadcast event from the first device to the second device (Para 111 lines 4-13);

wherein the communication system (1) comprises a first system (monitor device 3A in one room such as living room connected to the optical disk device through the network I/F as the first system) and a second system (monitor device 3B in another room such as bed room connected to the optical disk device through the network I/F as the second system), wherein the first device (3A) operates within the first system and the second device (3B) operates within the second system.

Nakata is silent about sending the plurality of broadcast information from the second device to the third device in response to an occurrence associated with the at least one broadcast event; and

launching monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by a third client on the third device in response receiving the plurality of broadcast information sent from the second device.



In an analogous art, Finseth teaches monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by a third client on the third device in response receiving the plurality of broadcast information sent from the second device (Para 87 lines 1-14, server is the 2<sup>nd</sup> client, the remaining group members is the 3<sup>rd</sup> client).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nakata's system to include monitoring of the at least one broadcast event by a third client on the third device in response receiving the plurality of broadcast information sent from the second device, as taught by Finseth so more viewers can share the broadcast information.

Regarding Claim 63, Nakata further discloses **the occurrence comprising** one or a combination of occurrences selected from a group consisting of an event start time, **a user input received by the first device** (Para 77 lines 1-6), a user input received by the second device, a user input received by the third device, a detection of movement of the third device, a deactivation of the first device, a deactivation of the first client, an activation of the third device, an activation of a first transfer application operating within the first device, an activation of a second transfer application operating within the second device, an activation of a third transfer application operating within the third device, an establishment of a communication connection between the first device and the second device, and an establishment of a communication connection between the second device and the third device.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34, 36-70 and 72-86 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In reference to Applicant's arguments

Nakata teaches only a single communication system consisting of devices hard-wired to a single IEEE 1394 bus, where all monitoring is performed by a single entity. While the Office Action suggests that Nakata teaches such a multiple-communication system at FIG. 1, elements 3A and 3B, Applicant respectfully traverses this suggestion. Nakata expressly teaches at paragraph [0037], "The AV system comprises an optical disk device 2, and monitor devices 3A and 3B which are connected through a bus BUS specified in IEEE1394 to form a network." Thus, no transfer occurs.

Examiner's response

As recited in Examiner's response from the last office action mailed on 07/30/2010, the distinction between two systems are not recited in the claims; thus, given broadest interpretation in light of the specifications, the teaching of Nakata that a client device in a living room communicating with a server can be interpreted as a system while another client device communicating with the server in a bedroom\* to be interpreted as another system.

Furthermore, Nakata also discloses the device communication might not be limited to IEEE1394 interface, a diversity of serial and parallel interfaces and further in a variety of wire or wireless communication network are used (Para 112). Therefore, the teaching of Nakata for monitoring of programming is not just limited to IEEE1394 interface only.

In reference to Applicant's arguments

In the most recent Office Action, in the Response to Arguments section beginning at page 17, the Examiner notes that the transferring function is not recited in the independent claims. Applicant has now amended the claims to include this feature. Applicant respectfully submits Nakata has no disclosure of such a system.

Examiner's response

I think Applicant misunderstand Examiner's intent in the Examiner's response. Examiner's intent is to indicate that the limitations of "transfer of content monitoring between two distinct communication systems (such as between wire and wireless) is not cited in the claims.

***Conclusion***

8. Claims 1-34, 36-70 and 72-86 are rejected.
9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Correspondence Information***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRED PENG whose telephone number is (571)270-1147. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 09:30-19:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hirl can be reached on (571) 272-3685. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2426

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fred Peng/

Examiner, Art Unit 2426

/Joseph P. Hirl/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426

January 1, 2011